

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 14, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Claims 1-3 and 6 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 179544 (JP '544). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-3 and 6 are dependent, recites a method for assembling a rotor of a power transmission device having an oscillator and a rotor rotatably assembled into said oscillator. The method includes loading a plurality of rolling elements to be arranged between said rotor and said oscillator via a retainer for positioning said rolling elements from inside said retainer, and assembling said rotor inside said loaded rolling elements.

As discussed below, JP '544 fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

JP '544 generally describes a needle roller having a holder including an external member 3, an internal member 4, and a roller 2. See paragraph [0013] and Drawing 1. The external member 3 has an annular section 3a of a major diameter, and flange 3b which show a bending of the shaft-orientations of both ends of this annular section 3a to the bore side from the path of the pitch circle PCD of a roller array the outside direction. The internal member 4 forms pockets 5 and 6 in two or more circumferential directions at

equal intervals, respectively. As clearly shown in Figures 1 and 7 of JP '544, the roller 2 is positioned where the external member 3 is holding the roller 2 at a location radially within the roller 2. Thus, the external member 3 falls under the roller 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of loading a plurality of rolling elements to be arranged between said rotor and said oscillator via a retainer for positioning said rolling elements from inside said retainer, as recited in claim 1. Instead, JP '544 discloses how the rollers 74 are inserted only in paragraph [0003], with references to Figure 7. Please note that paragraph [0003] and Figure 7 relate to the Prior Art of JP '544. Paragraph [0003] states that rollers 74 are conventionally inserted from the outside of the retainer 70, while deforming the retainer 70. Further, the size of each stopper 76 of packets 75 is smaller than an outer diameter of each roller 74. Figure 1 of JP '544 has the same situation as Figure 7 thereof completely.

Thus, since the rollers 74 are inserted into pockets 75 of the retainer 70 as the retainer 70 changes shape, Applicants respectfully submit that it can not possibly be determined how to insert the rollers, based on the size of the rolling elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that because it cannot be determined in JP '544 how the rollers 74 are inserted into the retainers 70, JP '544 fails to disclose or suggest the feature that the rollers are inserted from the inside of the retainers, as recited in claim 1.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that because it cannot be determined how the rollers are inserted in JP '544, JP '544 cannot be interpreted as disclosing that the rollers are inserted from the inside of the retainers, as recited in claim 1. As discussed above, the description of JP '544 does not expressly or implicitly state that the rollers 74 are inserted from inside the retainers 70. Further, any assertion that this feature is inherent is not supported in either the specification, or any of Figures 1, 6 and 7, as alleged in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that each element of claim 1 and 2 are not either expressly or inherently disclosed in JP '544.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claim 2 depends from claim 1, claim 2 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that JP '544 fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 2.

Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) of claims 1 and 2 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over JP '544 in view of US Patent No. 4,398,777 to Murphy (Murphy). The Office Action again took the position that JP '544 disclosed all of the features of claim 3, except the feature of pulling out the inner support ring. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited

references taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 3. Specifically, Applicants submit that JP '544 is deficient at least for the same reasons discussed above and Murphy fails to make up for these deficiencies.

Murphy is directed to a roller assembly with roller retention mechanism. Murphy generally describes a roller assembly including a casing or body 10 (see column 2, lines 33-44, and Figs. 1 and 2). A bore 12 extends through the body 10. A plurality of rollers 14 extend lengthwise within the bore 12 and are in contact with a surface 16 of the bore 12. However, Murphy fails to mention, disclose or suggest at least the feature that the rollers are inserted from the inside of the retainer. Therefore, Murphy fails to cure the deficiencies of JP '544.

Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 3. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over JP '544. The Office Action took Official Notice that a rotor ring is conventionally installed on a rotor subsequent to installation of a bearing element thereon, and to install such a rotor ring against the rolling elements/retainer of JP would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 6.

Specifically, Applicants submit that JP '544 is deficient at least for the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the Official Notice taken in the Office Action. There is no support in the record or in the relevant art for such a conclusion.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide evidence that a rotor ring is conventionally installed on a rotor subsequent to installation of a bearing element thereon, and to install such a rotor ring against the rolling elements/retainer of JP '544 would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, as alleged in the Office Action.


Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 6. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-3 and 6 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that each of claims 1-3 and 6 be allowed and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

  
David E. Brown  
Registration No. 51,091

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time  
Check No. 13892